

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated May 1, 2008, the Assignee respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above amendments and on the following remarks.

Claims 1-4, 6-22, 24-33, and 35-43 are pending in this application. Claims 5, 23, and 34 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Telephone Interview

Examiner Nguyen is thanked for the telephone interview of July 22, 2008. The amendments to the claims were discussed. The undersigned also pointed to the paragraphs in the specification that support the amendments. The undersigned also explained how the amendments distinguish over the cited documents. Examiner Nguyen would only recommend formal submission, and he would then have more time to consider the response.

Rejection of Claims over *Heard, Balogh, and Sweeney*

Claims 1-2, 4-8, 11-13, 15-19, 22-24, 26-30, 33-35, and 37-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2006/0242685 to Heard, *et al.* in view of U.S. Patent 7,047,258 to Balogh, *et al.* and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,966,715 to Sweeney, *et al.*

As noted above, however, claims 5, 23, and 34 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering this rejection moot with regards to claims 5, 23, and 34.

The pending claims, however, are not obvious over *Heard, Balogh, and Sweeney*. These claims recite, or incorporate, many features that are not disclosed or suggested by the proposed combination of *Heard, Balogh, and Sweeney*. Independent claim 1, for example, recites “*the control unit intercepting a message for opening a window associated with the requested*

computer application, the control unit intercepting the message before receipt thereof by the computer's internal operating system, the control unit querying the another version of the computer access settings for the requested computer application, and when the requested computer application is not found in the another version of the computer access settings, then the control unit prohibits opening the window associated with the requested computer application, thus terminating the launch of the requested computer application, as the user is not authorized to access the requested computer application." Support for such features may be found at least in the as-filed application at paragraphs [0060] and [0061]. Independent claim 1 is reproduced below, and independent claims 11, 22, and 33 recite similar features.

1. A system for automatically updating computer access settings, comprising:

at least one computer access setting for a respective user of a computer, the at least one computer access setting comprising a listing of prohibited computer applications to which access is denied, one version of the at least one computer access setting being stored in a remote database and another version of the at least one computer access setting being stored in the computer; and

a control unit to communicate with the computer and to automatically update the versions of the at least one computer access settings in the computer and the remote database to coincide with each other responsive to at least one computer event, wherein the at least one control access setting being stored in the remote database is updated to reflect changes made to the at least one control access setting being stored in the computer and vice versa, the control unit monitoring a request to launch a computer application that would locally run on the computer's operating system, the control unit intercepting a message for opening a window associated with the requested computer application, the control unit intercepting the message before receipt thereof by the computer's internal operating system, the control unit querying the another version of the computer access settings for the requested computer application, and when the requested computer application is not found in the another version of the computer access settings, then the control unit prohibits opening the window associated with the requested computer application, thus terminating the launch of the requested computer application, as the user is not authorized to access the requested computer application.

The proposed combination of *Heard*, *Balogh*, and *Sweeney* does not obviate all these features. *Heard* discloses policy packages that are automatically “pushed” to mobile devices. See U.S. Patent Application Publication 2006/0242685 to *Heard, et al.* at paragraphs [0027] through [0031]. While *Heard* describes a “system interface” that intercepts system calls, *Heard*’s “system interface” intercepts external events with an external operating system. *Id.* at paragraph [0068]. *Balogh* discusses validation of local and remote databases. See U.S. Patent 7,047,258 to *Balogh, et al.* at column 2, lines 10-13. *Sweeney* describes an acyclic mechanism which manages users’ authorizations to execute applications. See U.S. Patent 5,966,715 to *Sweeney, et al.* at column 5, lines 10-15.

Regardless, the combined teaching of *Heard*, *Balogh*, and *Sweeney* does not obviate the independent claims. *Heard, Balogh, and Sweeney* fails to teach or suggest “*intercepting a message for opening a window associated with the requested computer application, ... before receipt thereof by the computer’s internal operating system*” (emphasis added). As the above paragraph explains, *Heard, Balogh, and Sweeney* only teaches intercepting external events with an external operating system. Moreover, *Heard, Balogh, and Sweeney* also fails to teach or suggest “*prohibit[ing] opening the window associated with the requested computer application, thus terminating the launch of the requested computer application, as the user is not authorized to access the requested computer application.*” One of ordinary skill in the art, then, would not think that the independent claims are obvious over *Heard, Balogh, and Sweeney*.

Claims 1-2, 4, 6-8, 11-13, 15-19, 22, 24, 26-30, 33, 35, and 37-41, then, cannot be obvious over *Heard, Balogh, and Sweeney*. Independent claims 1, 11, 22, and 33 recite many features that are not taught or suggested by *Heard, Balogh, and Sweeney*. The dependent claims incorporate these same features and recite additional features. One of ordinary skill in the art, then, would not think that claims 1-2, 4, 6-8, 11-13, 15-19, 22, 24, 26-30, 33, 35, and 37-41 are obvious, so the Office is respectfully requested to remove the § 103 (a) rejection of these claims.

Rejection of Claims over *Heard, Balogh, Sweeney & Dunn*

Claims 3, 9-10, 14, 20-21, 25, 31-32, 36, and 42-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over *Heard*, *Balogh*, and *Sweeney* and further in view of 7,076,558 to *Dunn*. These claims, however, cannot be obvious over the proposed combination of *Heard*, *Balogh*, *Sweeney* and *Dunn*. These claims depend, respectively from independent claim 1, 11, 22, and 33. These claims, then, incorporate the same distinguishing features and recite additional features. As the above paragraphs already explained, *Heard*, *Balogh*, and *Sweeney* all fail to teach or suggest all the features of independent claims 1, 11, 22, and 33, and *Dunn* does not cure these deficiencies. The Office alleges that *Dunn* teaches computer events, such as logging out and a connection to the Internet. The Office even cites to *Dunn* at column 37, lines 4-11, but the Assignee finds no such teaching. Regardless, the combined teaching of *Heard*, *Balogh*, *Sweeney* and *Dunn* still fails to teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1, 11, 22, and 33. Claims 3, 9-10, 14, 20-21, 25, 31-32, 36, and 42-43, then, are not obvious over *Heard*, *Balogh*, *Sweeney* and *Dunn*, so the Office is respectfully requested to remove the § 103 (a) rejection of these claims.

If any questions arise, the Office is requested to contact the undersigned at (919) 469-2629 or scott@scottzimmerman.com.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott P. Zimmerman
Attorney for the Assignee
Reg. No. 41,390